

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 25 and 39-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. More specifically, claims 25 and 50 have been rejected in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,118,915 (Sato); claims 39-44, 48 and 49 are rejected in view of Sato and EP 0895 112 A1 (Mori); and claims 45-46 are rejected in view of Sato and U.S. Patent No. 6,236,787 (Laughlin).

As previously provided, independent claims 25 and 50 have been amended. As amended, claims 25 and 50 recite, in part, that the mounts and the package are separately formed. The remaining pending claims depend from claim 25 either directly or indirectly and thus as a matter of law incorporate the limitations of claim 25.

Applicants believe that the claimed invention is distinguishable from the cited art even if properly combinable. At the outset, Sato at a minimum fails to disclose or suggest that the mounts are separately formed from the package as claimed. Further, the Patent Office cannot rely solely on the remaining other references even if combinable to remedy the deficiencies of Sato where the remaining other references have been primarily relied on for teachings allegedly relating to limitations of the dependent claims in further support of the obviousness rejections. Therefore, Applicants believe the cited art even if combinable fails to render obvious the claimed invention based on at least these reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejections be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit reconsideration of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 807-4310

Dated: June 13, 2005